

United States to allow its Government to shut down.

What can we do about it? The train wreck requires two trains. All we have to do is stop, look, and listen, and take steps to avert the train wreck. We have those in place, if only we would utilize them. What are they, Mr. Speaker? No. 1, for almost every term since I have been here this same train wreck has loomed in the vision and the future of each Congress since 1980, I believe. What happens? When September 30 comes and no budget has been enacted, then the Congress engages in all kinds of legalistic and legislative contortions to keep the Government going until the next impasse should occur, with still a deadline that has not produced a budget.

If the President of the United States should veto the appropriation bills that the House passes, he will be saying in no uncertain terms: "I want these bills to be revisited, and I want more money spent in them," because the budget appropriation bills that the House Republicans have fashioned to present to the President call for lower spending, so the President, I suppose, in sending them back and vetoing them, says "I want more spending."

Should we allow him to veto those bills with no plan for then enacting a full budget to his liking? That is why the train wreck may occur. What I have proposed in term after term since I have been here is the following: Instant replay. If the Congress and the President have failed to enact the budget by September 30 of any given year, then, according to my legislation, the next day, October 1, beginning the new fiscal year, automatically will go into place by way of instant replay the budget of last year.

What does that do? That frees the spending at the levels of the previous year. What else does it do? It prevents for all time, forever, the possibility of and the reality of shutting down the Government. Was it not awful to have in 1990 the spectacle of our youngsters, all of them, gathered in Desert Shield in Saudi Arabia waiting for Desert Storm to occur, and while they are waiting there, preparing for battle, the U.S. Government, their country's Government, shuts down? That actually happened.

If for no other reason than to have that never happen again, we should enact my instant replay legislation, not to mention the thousands of Federal workers who have to meet budgetary outlays, pay bills, feed their families, and do the necessary things to keep house and home and family together. Why should they be used as pawns in an unnecessary game being played by the White House and the Congress? I ask for support for my legislation.

□ 1845

FOUR SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN MEDICINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, there are four significant changes that are happening in our society that have to do with the field of medicine and the reason that medicine right now is going to be a hotly debated subject in the coming months, in the coming years, in our society.

I would say that those changes are philosophical changes, No. 1, in Washington, which I hate to use it but will, is a new paradigm, a new way of looking at things; No. 2, technological changes; No. 3, the possible bankruptcy of Medicare; No. 4, changes in the Medicaid delivery system.

Let me start with No. 1, though, philosophical changes in Washington. We have some 80 new freshmen this year, all of whom I would describe as very regular folks who want to cut the budget and go home. They are not trying to be the next President. They are not trying to run for other offices. They just want to do the right thing. They are very attuned to the problems of middle-class America and businesses and employers, and they are just not as political as I would say classes have been in the past.

I would say also that the reforms, the changes, are not attributable to the Republican Party alone. President Clinton, his election in 1992 did a lot to trigger the moves of reform and the debate for change in health care.

A couple of things that we have seen as evidence of a new philosophy in this House, tangible evidence, the tort reform bill that we for many years debated that never got out of committee, it actually passed the House this year; OSHA reforms, where we are trying to get OSHA to be more technological and employer-friendly and more concentrated on safety rather than concentrating strictly on fines. We are trying to get the FDA to put more money and manpower in faster approval of pills, of medical devices, rather than also being punitive and restrictive in their ways of doing business.

Then of course the biggest thing is, we are taking a serious stab at budget reduction. Interest is the third largest expenditure on our national budget right now. In 2 years it is projected to exceed the defense budget, so we have got to do things about it.

I would say, No. 1, that philosophical changes, we are looking at doing things differently; No. 2, technological changes. We passed this huge telecommunications bill recently. In that will be new avenues for such things as telemedicine. There is going to be the Internet. I believe the Internet will make medicine a lot more consumer-friendly, because a person back home

right now does not know how much a broken arm or broken leg is going to cost.

On an Internet system, they can figure it out, figure out what orthopedists are charging, which ones are the best at this, which hospitals will get them in and out the fastest, and so forth. That would be the case with every operation. You could go in there, plug in whatever your ailment is, and see how much it costs for certain treatments, and so forth, and see who is best at it. I think that is going to make medicine a lot more competitive.

Those are some of the technological things, but I would say that the Federal Government's way of looking at medicine is with a slide rule, but we are in the world of pocket calculators now and we have to move. We have to make that change.

Then, No. 3, Medicare. The April trustees' report said clearly that Medicare will go bankrupt in 6 years if we do not do anything about it. We have to fix it. We have to do it in a non-partisan way. We need to simplify it, to protect and preserve it. We need to slow down the rate of growth.

There are all kinds of options out there that people are looking at and this Congress is going to be addressing, things that will make Medicare more consumer-friendly and again, above all, simplify and protect it.

Then, finally, changes in the Medicaid system, most significantly, welfare reform and block granting this authority back to States so that States have the flexibility. For example, I represent Georgia. Our Medicaid problems, our welfare delivery problems may be different than those in New York City or San Francisco, downtown Cincinnati, and we are going to make those changes but it is going to give the States the flexibility that they need.

Mr. Speaker, this is a lengthy subject. I look forward to the months of debate ahead, but I would say that the four significant changes again in medicine are philosophical changes, new ways of looking at things; changes in Medicare; changes in Medicaid; and, above all, the new technologies.

I thank the Speaker for this time. I will not say it is good to be back completely, but I notice that I am back and it is good to be here and see you, Mr. Speaker.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, there are many very pressing and important issues which we have been discussing. The previous speakers have been talking about some very pressing budget matters. But I have taken this time out this evening to talk about a personal item and that is the fact that

just last week one of our colleagues, Congressman MOOREHEAD, announced his retirement, and I wanted to take a moment. Usually people wait until the very end of the session to talk about Members who have chosen to retire, but I wanted to take just a moment to talk about a person who I believe is a stellar citizen legislator and one who will be sorely missed when he, after 12 terms of service here in the House of Representatives, will retire.

CARLOS MOORHEAD is a citizen legislator. He had a small law practice in his hometown of Glendale, CA where he had grown up. He went to Hoover High School and was one who regularly participated in many civic items, and he is one who chose public service. Now, we know that in this day and age public service itself is much maligned. We regularly see people who have chosen to spend some years of their life in public service criticized. But the fact of the matter is CARLOS MOORHEAD is a very unusual person. We all know from serving here in the House that he is not a show horse. He in fact is a workhorse.

He is the chairman of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee, not one of the most exciting issues discussed here on the House floor, but I am one who believes that it is very important. It is very important, as we look at international trade agreements and other items, that we maintain the intellectual property rights which are so key to the very unique talents which citizens of the United States of America have.

CARLOS served 6 years as a member of the California State Legislature before choosing to run for Congress in 1972. He served on that Judiciary Committee that held the impeachment hearings in the early 1970's, and his loyalty was very great. It has been written up in the media over the past week or so that he stood strongly behind Richard Nixon, and his quote in the papers consisted of the following: He believed it very important to maintain the Presidency at that time.

He also has been heavily involved in the issue of telecommunications, having served as ranking minority member when we were in the minority here on the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, and it was a great achievement to see the legislation which passed this House just before the August recess come about, and Mr. MOORHEAD had spent a long period of time working on that legislation.

I would simply like to say that it is going to be a great personal loss for me when, as he regularly reminds me, in a year and a half he chooses to retire. He will still be serving here for the next 17 some odd months and we know we are going to be spending a great deal of time here, but when he does choose to retire at the end of next year, it will be a personal loss.

I have had the privilege of trying to represent the district which joins his in Los Angeles County, and we all know that he has been a great friend, a very

hard worker, and I happen to believe one of the most underestimated Members of this institution. When he does retire, he will be sorely missed by many of us.

BALANCING THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House regarding the budget, the debt ceiling that we are now approaching, and why that is important to the American people in an expanded economy for the United States and an expanded job market.

First let us look at the overspending of the Federal Government. Back in 1947 the Federal budget represented 12 percent of this country's gross domestic product. Today it represents almost 22 percent of the gross domestic product. The Federal Government is expanding at an alarming rate.

The Government has not relied on the political negatives of increasing taxes to afford this increased spending, but rather has decided that it is more politically wise to continue borrowing. Our Federal debt today is \$4.8 trillion. Our Federal debt after two world wars was only \$340 billion. We are increasing spending at an alarming rate and you know most people in America say we do not care how Government keeps its books; what we want is better jobs and a better economy.

Here is why it is important. Here is why how we keep our books affects those jobs and affects the economy of this country. Government this year is borrowing 42 percent of all of the money lent out in the United States. Think what that extra demand does for the pressure to increase interest rates.

Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, suggests that if we are able to balance our budget, we will see interest rates drop between 1½ and 2 percentage points. He says if that happens, the stimulation to the economy and the jobs in this country will be greater than we have ever seen before in our history. He says the flip side is that if we do not do it, we will give our children a lower standard of living and less expectations to have a good life than we have had. That will be the first time in history.

How do we achieve a balanced budget with a group of politicians that sit in this Chamber and the one on the other side of the Capitol that are used to expanding programs, that are used to going back home with pork barrel projects, cutting the ribbons and getting their pictures in the paper and being on television, bringing more good programs to the people back home, and they have discovered that it enhances their chances of being reelected. The challenge is great today for these Representatives to say if we want a good future for our kids and not leave the

kids the mortgage of our overindulgence and overspending, we are going to have to cut back on some of those programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask everybody in the United States to look at this predicament, to encourage their Members in Congress that it is important that we all tighten our belts. A group of us, 156 of us, have signed a letter to the President saying that we are not going to vote to increase the debt ceiling unless we are on an absolute glide path to a balanced budget. Now, that means passing legislation that limits spending, that changes some of the entitlement programs, that has appropriation bills that get us on that glide path to a balanced budget. It is important.

We met with Secretary Rubin. We have now introduced legislation to give the President authority and flexibility to prioritize in the event that debt ceiling is reached. It is important, Mr. Speaker. I hope we are able to stick together to hang tough, to do what is good for America, to disregard the pollsters, to disregard the special interest lobbyists that are pushing for more and more spending, and do what is necessary to give this country and our children and our grandchildren a good future.

EASTERN LONG ISLAND FIRE UNDER CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] is recognized for 20 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the strongest and finest steel is forged from the hottest fire. So too, the wonderful people of Eastern Long Island emerge stronger and more resilient from the worst brush fire in modern memory, bolstered by the bravery of its volunteer firefighters, police, and other emergency personnel and by the tens of thousands of acts of kindness displayed throughout this nationally declared disaster that was televised around the world.

It is with deep sense of relief and gratitude that I report to you today that all is now quiet on Eastern Long Island. The raging fire is no more; thanks to the determination and hard work of 3,000 firefighters—volunteer firefighters, I might add—who came from all over Nassau and Suffolk counties, New York and even Connecticut; along with county, State and Federal fire experts; various military units, State, county, town, and village police officers and other emergency personnel, and the wonderful Red Cross all make possible a satisfying end to what otherwise could have been a most unfortunate disaster. Starting on Monday, August 21, 1995, in the Rocky Point area, then on Thursday erupting in Eastport-Westhampton, for over 13 days our raging brush fires devastated more than 7,000 acres of the precious